



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,795	04/30/2001	Marten Stjernstrom	P0214	3545
26271	7590	05/03/2005	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP			HANDY, DWAYNE K	
1301 MCKINNEY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 5100			1743	
HOUSTON, TX 77010-3095				

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/830,795	STJERNSTROM, MARTEN
	Examiner Dwayne K. Handy	Art Unit 1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 6-12 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 6-12 and 14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 6-8, 10, 12 and 14 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Litborn (WO 98/33052) in view of Williams et al. (5,171,989).

3. Claims 9 and 14 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Litborn (WO 98/33052) and Williams et al. (5,171,989) and further in view of Mian (6,319,469).

These rejections remain in effect. Please see Response to Arguments below.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 1/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In traversing the arguments made by the Examiner in the previous action, applicant has argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Williams with the method of Litborn since (1) Williams does not address the issue of evaporation prevention or reaction of materials in the sample and that evaporation would not be a consideration in an apparatus with a vacuum chamber; and (2) One of ordinary skill in the art would not be inclined to combine a teaching from a mass spectrometry method with a method of evaporation prevention/solvent replacement. The Examiner respectfully disagrees on both counts.

5. The Examiner recognizes that Williams does not address evaporation prevention. The Examiner again reiterates that Williams provides a teaching of providing a solvent addition to a mixture for the purpose of altering properties of the mixture, however. There is no need for Williams to provide evaporation control since it is already achieved by Litborn. Instead, the Examiner relied upon passages from Litborn that suggest their method may also be applicable in instances where the covering liquid is chosen to "interact with the reaction products" (claim 9, page 9, lines 23-26 and 31-34) or "provide reagents" (claims 10 and 11, page 9, lines 27-30). The Examiner believes these passages – while not specifically stating use of a solvent that is "miscible" (i.e. capable of mixing) with the sample - suggest a mixing of the solvent and sample phases would be desirable in certain circumstances to exchange reactants and or products. This led

the Examiner to Williams. Williams teaches the addition of solvents to an aqueous sample while continuously feeding the sample to a mass spectrometer. The solvent is miscible with the sample and alters the properties of the sample upon mixing. This changing of properties would be advantageous in mixing the solvent and aqueous sample from Litborn.

6. The Examiner also reminds applicant that it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Examiner believes that the one of ordinary skill in the art would look at the addition of solvent to the sample in Williams as a way to provide the mixing suggested in Litborn. This is reasonably pertinent to the problem of trying to move compounds between two phases that are already in contact with one another – as in Litborn.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dwayne K. Handy whose telephone number is (571)-272-1259. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571)-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DKH
April 29, 2005


Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700